



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,743	01/10/2002	Scott James Weaver	9288 (3225-130)	3989

26884 7590 06/27/2005

PAUL W. MARTIN
LAW DEPARTMENT, WHQ-4
1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD.
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER

VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/041,743

Applicant(s)

WEAVER, SCOTT JAMES

Examiner

Tuan A. Vu

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20020110
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

486

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed January 10, 2002.

Claims 1-16 have been submitted for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hawley, USPubN: 2004/0083463 (hereinafter Hawley).

As per claim 1, Hawley discloses a method of integrating a first software component with a second software component, the method comprising the steps of:

creating a schema (e.g. pg. 10, para 0207-0208; XML Services 202-206 - Fig. 15; pg. 8, para 0160); integrating the schema into a data wedge (e.g. *model 204*- Fig. 15; Fig. 16);

populating a data model in the data wedge (e.g. pg. 6, para 0132-0137; pg. 7, para 0144-0151; Fig. 21); and

translating data elements in the data model from a first format of the first software component schema to a second format of the second software component (e.g. pg. 2, *presentation patterns, interpreter*, para 0021, para 0025-0026; *encoding ... into interpreter-readable* - pg. 8, para 0156).

As per claim 2, Hawley discloses triggering an event to notify the second software component of translated data element availability (e.g. pg.9, para 0189 – Note: update of component in a viewer in response to change of another reads on notifying event; *synchronization services* – pg. 11, para 0214, 0218-0219).

As per claim 3, Hawley discloses removing component no longer needed (para 0155, pg. 7) and also synchronization services (e.g. *messages* - pg. 11, para 0214, 0218-0219) hence has disclosed the step of removing obsolete data elements from the data model to make data to sync up together (pg.9, para 0189).

As per claim 4, Hawley discloses creating an instance of a data wedge (e.g. Fig. 3; *application model, specific panel...model 341* – pg. 8, para 0156).

As per claim 6, Hawley discloses integrating the schema into the data wedge but does not make it explicit that such step includes setting default data elements and data values. Official notice is taken that a model being imported into a framework as a reuseable templates such as to have therein default fields and variable values was a known concept at the time the invention was made; such concept can be inferred from the setting of value by Hawley and attribute fields in the XML specifications (see Fig 13, *set Attribute value*; Table 1, pg. 14-17). Hence the setting of value to overwrite the model default values during the integration of model, specifications into the data wedge is disclosed.

As per claim 7, Hawley discloses modifying a data element in the data model of the first software component (e.g. *first type, object, second type, object* – pg. 1, para 0010-0013, para 0025 pg. 2).

As per claim 8, Hawley discloses a computer system for integrating software components comprising: a processor; and a memory coupled to said processor; the memory having stored therein data and sequences of instructions which, when executed by said processor, cause said processor to integrate software components by causing the processor to:

create a schema,

integrate the schema into a data wedge,

populate a data model in the data wedge, and

translate data elements in the data model from a first format of a first software component schema to a second format of a second software component; all of these steps having been addressed in the corresponding rejection thereof in claim 1.

As per claims 9-11, 12 and 14, these claims correspond to claims 2-4, 7, and 6 respectively; and are rejected with the corresponding rejections as set forth therein.

As per claim 15, Hawley discloses a computer implemented system for integrating a first and second software component having a first and second schema respectively (para 0143-0155, pg. 7) and a first and second data view respectively (Fig. 3; *application model, specific panel...model 341* – pg. 8, para 0156 – Note: pool of tiles per workflow container and corresponding model reference reads on first model component and its associated AS-Language schema being fetched into a data wedge), the system comprising:

a data wedge (viewer, workbench container – Fig. 7,11) configured to translate a data element from the first data view in accordance with the first schema to the second data view in accordance with the second schema (e.g. Fig. 7, 11, 21-22; para 0139, pg. 7; para 0173, pg. 9 – Note: fetching of a model and its associated AS-language or schema to be remodeled or reedited

Art Unit: 2193

on the workbench – see Fig. 22, 26-28 – to obtain another model with a corresponding newly created AS-language and stored patterns reads on translating first data view plus schema into a second view plus schema).

As per claim 16, Hawley discloses that data wedge is further configured to trigger an event to notify the second software component of translated data element availability (e.g. pg.9, para 0189 – Note: update of component in a viewer in response to change of another reads on implied step using a notifying event; *synchronization services* – pg. 11, para 0214, 0218-0219).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley, USPubN: 2004/0083463 as applied to claims 1, 8 above.

As per claim 5, Hawley discloses the application viewer with model instance and wedge specific for some application (para 0137-0143) with tiles and workflow enabling specification schema to be compliant with a data model and a data wedge name (para 0145-0157 – pg. 7-8) and application xml specification (or schema) corresponding to a user-interface model (e.g AS-Language, model 341 - pg. 9, para 0173; para 0176-0177, pg. 9); but does not specifically disclose schema including a data model and a data wedge name. Based on Hawley's mapping of a model (model name) and a workbench/viewer (data wedge) including attribute definition in conjunction with XML specification (see model 341, workbench Fig. 6; Data model 204,

Art Unit: 2193

attribute panel 254; Table 1, pg. 14-17; Fig. 11), in conjunction with specification schema from above, it have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide specification schema so that it include a name both for Hawley's data model and the data wedge for a specific MDF application because of the nature of Hawley's system being a framework that reuses middleware model and adapt stored MDF application reference numbers to corresponding specification language and model (see para 0204-0207 – pg. 10; pg. 6, para 0132); and having names of data wedge or model specified in the specification documents will alleviate recreation of components that have been stored and enable efficient reuse of components that can be retrieved based on name referencing via the schema in the specification documents as mentioned above.

As per claim 13, this claim corresponds to claim 5 above, hence is rejected with the rejection rationale as set forth therein.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence – please consult Examiner before using) or 703-872-9306 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Art Unit: 2193

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VAT
June 20, 2005



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER